TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	i
OPINIONS BELOW	2
JURISDICTION	2
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	3
CONCLUSION	6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Due to the uniqueness and rare happenstance that there is a profoundly deaf person appearing as his own counsel, it is nearly impossible to look up case histories to see and compare the rights wrongs in this matter of record to be of any use.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1972

No.

WILLIAM E. HUMBLE,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner is a deaf oralist never having graduated from any college nor does he expect to win any writing essays much less does he expect his Writ of Certiorari to win top honors for accuracy, brevity and clearness although he does try and he relies heavily on the use of a dictionary to clear him through "big words." Petitioner is a self-taught individualist who knows well the needs and desires of his people.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinions of the courts below as evidenced in some of the enclosed copies and all copies in the person or persons responsible for this class action yet to be brought before this court shall testify and affirm for themselves why this Writ of Certiorari should not be granted Petitioner.

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction comes in three parts in this Writ of Certiorari and each in themselves speak for the court of each instance: Part One covers what has happened at the Ninth District Court of Appeals and why Petitioner was refused a hearing.

Part Two refers to the denial to grant Petitioner his day in court of first instance and denial of his request to use his apparatus in court. Petitioner was given an appointed attorney over Petitioner's objection and Petitioner was given an interpreter over Petitioner's objection.

Part Three begins with the court of third instance and a stated request of settlement is presented for punitive and compensation from respondent as well as stated claim of right to Pasadena Playhouse of Petitioner be granted.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

May a deaf orally speaking Petitioner request compensation and punitive damages from respondent because respondent labelled Petitioner a "deaf mute"?

May Petitioner request compensation and punitive damages from a state, a county and a city wherein

original abusement to Petitioner's good character and social standing germinated providing said state, county and city were involved and contributive to heaping abusement on Petitioner up to granting of his Writ of Certiorari?

May Petitioner request compensation and punitive damages from the Postal System of the United States for its continued harassment and embarassment of Petitioner by stamping mail of Petitioner "Addressee Unknown" and returning to sender?

May Petitioner request the Court of third instance summon records, transcripts and exhibits from the courts below?

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

In the court of first instance the preliminary hearing was waived, the judge of the presiding jury trial requested a speedy hearing.

In the court of second instance the appeal of Petitioner was deceived and blocked from a fair hearing.

PART ONE

Pursuant to dismissal of Notice of Appeal filed with the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth District on May 14, 1971 at 8:55 A.M. and dismissal of a followup brief filed October 8, 1971 Petitioner charges staff members of the Ninth District of instrumentally blocking and with willful and wanton intend deprive Petitioner of a just and fair hearing on his Appeal.

Dismissal of Notice of Appeal resulted on February 18, 1972 and currently is at rest since then. Petitioner charges the Rules of the United States Court of Appeals

for the Ninth District allows telephone communication between single judge and Petitoner while on the other hand allows the Clerk of the Court and staff to bar or block written communications without the consent of a single judge. Proof of this communications block is provided by a letter written to Chief Judge Richard H. Chambers by Petitioner on December 9, 1971 and other letters of attempted mail communications.

Petitioner charges a staff member of the Clerk of the Court of Appeals of willful and wanton intentions to deceive and instrumentally blocking Petitioner of his rights to appeal when Petitioner appeared propria persona on two occasions to the office of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Petitioner possesses written notes and oral communication witness to this effect.

Petitioner charges the Clerk of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth District Carl B. Luck of instrumentally sending the Appeal Petition of Petitioner to dismissal by refusing to recognize and read the follow up brief letter of Petitioner dated September 23, 1971 and received September 27, 1971 by the Court of Appeals Clerk along with three copies of same and one Kirk letter.

Petitioner charges follow up brief letter above has indeed the genuine signature of Petitioner on the original and original was for the panel or single judge whom was to consider the Notice of Appeal of said Petitioner. Instead, the Clerk of the Court had blocked said genuine communications resulting in a "Declined to Consider" notation by R. W. Chambers, chief judge.

Thereafter the Clerk of the Court of Appeals had attempted to defame the character of Petitioner by attempting to make the matter paranoid.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth District, San Francisco, California is the court of second instance, Part One covers Rule 19(b) of Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States.

PART TWO

Petitioner petitions the Supreme Court of the United States to review the first original Notice of Appeal filed by Petitioner in the United States District Court for the Central District of California on April 9, 1971 at 8:43 P.M. with copy mailed to the United States Solicitor General and one delivered propria persona at the office of Robert L. Meyer, Esq., United States Attorney for the Central District. Petitioner never mailed a copy to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Petitioner claims that he is profoundly deaf, unable to benefit from the use of a hearing aid (one must have some hearing in order for a hearing aid to be useful and in cases where one has just a little hearing it is dangerous for this person relying on a hearing aid to assume normal hearing because this places the wearer in a confused, unsure state) and has been without any hearing since the age of six.

Petitioner claims that he lost his hearing ability, not his ability to speak and has never been a mute in his entire life.

Petitioner claims he possesses an apparatus designed to integrate communications between hearing people and hearing impaired for the benefit and advantage of the highest court of the land and all other courts below. Said apparatus makes no sound and is not disturbing nor annoying.

The United States Court for the Central District of California, Los Angeles, California is the court of first instance, Part Two covers Rule 20 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner petitions the Supreme Court of the United States to review his original Class Action form prepared propria persona on the 25th day of May, 1972 then a letter of reply from Michael Rodak, Jr., Clerk of the United States Supreme Court on May 31, 1972.

Petitioner claims that he possesses a claim of right to acquisition of the Pasadena Playhouse situated on 39 South El Molino Avenue, Pasadena, California and has held dearly to this claim despite severe and powerful abusement from respondent.

Petitioner claims the abusement to his good character and social standing has resulted in the reason for punitive and compensation from respondent.

In conclusion, Petitioner petitions the "specially admitted to the bar of this court for purposes limited to a particular case" as found in Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States procedure under Rule 6 be granted Petitioner. Petitioner is sole counsel in propria persona and as stated in his Class Action form Petitioner requested ODE Internationale Foundation, 39 South El Molino, Pasadena, California, 91109 be the recipient of this judgment. This then leaves the Petitioner as recipient

of attorney fees incurred from this judgment, a savings to the respondent.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM E. HUMBLE
39 S. El Molino
Pasadena, California 91109
Counsel in Propria Persona

APPENDIX

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

September 1970 Grand Jury

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	NO. 7679 CD
Plaintiff,	)	INDICTMENT
v.	)	[18 U.S.C. §1702: Obstruction of Correspondence; 18 U.S.C. §1708: Possession of Stolen Mail]
WILLIAM C. HUMBLE,	)	
Defendant.	)	

The Grand Jury charges:

COUNT ONE

[18 U.S.C. §1702]

On or about January 23, 1971, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, defendant WILLIAM C. HUMBLE took a letter addressed to Pasadena Playhouse, 39 South El Molino, Pasadena, California, which theretofore had been in a Post Office, before it had been delivered to the addressee, with design to obstruct the correspondence, and opened the same.

COUNT TWO

[18 U.S.C. §1702]

On or about January 27, 1971, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, defendant WILLIAM C. HUMBLE took a letter addressed to Pasadena Playhouse, 39 South El Molino, Pasadena, California, which theretofore had been in a Post Office, before it had been delivered to the addressee, with design to obstruct the correspondence, and opened the same.

COUNT THREE

[18 U.S.C. §1702]

On or about January 27, 1971, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, defendant WILLIAM C. HUMBLE took a letter addressed to Office of Admissions, Pasadena Playhouse College of Theatre Arts, 39 South El Molino, Pasadena, California 91101, which theretofore had been in a Post Office, before it had been delivered to the addressee, with design to obstruct the correspondence, and opened the same.

COUNT FOUR

[18 U.S.C. §1702]

On or about February 1, 1971, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, defendant WILLIAM C. HUMBLE took a letter addressed to Pasadena Playhouse College of Theatre Arts, Pasadena, California 91109, which theretofore had been in a Post Office, before it had been delivered to the addressee, with design to obstruct the correspondence, and opened the same.

COUNT FIVE

[18 U.S.C. §1702]

On or about January 27, 1971, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, defendant WILLIAM C. HUMBLE took a letter addressed to Pasadena Playhouse College of Theatre Arts, Pasadena, California 91109, which theretofore had been in a Post Office, before it had been delivered to the addressee with design to obstruct the correspondence, and opened the same.

COUNT SIX

[18 U.S.C. §1708]

On or about February 24, 1971, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, defendant WILLIAM C. HUMBLE unlawfully had in his possession the contents of a letter, which had been stolen from the mail, addressed to Registrar, Pasadena Playhouse College of Theatre Arts, 39 S. El Molino Ave., Pasadena, California 91101, and at said time and place defendant well knew said contents of said letter had been stolen.

COUNT SEVEN

[18 U.S.C. §1708]

On or about February 24, 1971, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, defendant WILLIAM C. HUMBLE unlawfully had in his possession the contents of a letter, which had been stolen from the mail, addressed to Director of Admissions, Pasadena Playhouse College of Theatre Arts, 39 South El Molino Ave., Pasadena, California 91101, and at said time and place defendant well knew said contents of said letter had been stolen.

COUNT EIGHT

[18 U.S.C. §1708]

On or about February 24, 1971, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, defendant WILLIAM C. HUMBLE, unlawfully had in his possession the contents of a letter, which had been stolen from the mail, addressed to Dean of the Graduate School, Pasadena Playhouse College of Theatre Arts, Pasadena, California, and at said time and place defendant well knew said contents of said letter had been stolen.

POOR COPY

COUNT NINE

[18 U.S.C. §1708]

On or about February 24, 1971, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, defendant WILLIAM C. HUMBLE, unlawfully had in his possession the contents of a letter, which had been stolen from the mail, addressed to Director of Admissions, Pasadena Playhouse College of Theatre Arts, Pasadena, California, and at said time and place defendant well knew said contents of said letter had been stolen.

A TRUE BILL

_____
Foreman

ROBERT L. MEYER
United States Attorney

Judy Dage

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
Plaintiff-Appellee,	)	
v.	)	No. Undocketed
WILLIAM E. HEMBLE,	)	
Defendant-Appellant.	)	(26-7679 Crim.)

Before: KOELSCH and GOODWIN, Circuit Judges

ORDER

At the Clerk's suggestion, this cause is dismissed for appellant's failure to timely perfect the appeal.

M. Oliver Koelsch

United States Circuit Judges

FILED

FEB 18 1972

WM. B. LUCK, CLERK

No. Cal. 2/14/72

OR COPY

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1972

No. 72-346

WILLIAM E. HUMBLE, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

Petitioner has been placed on probation after conviction, in a jury trial in the District Court for the Central District of California, of obstruction of correspondence in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1702 and possession of stolen mail in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1708. On February 18, 1972, the court of appeals dismissed an appeal from the conviction for failure to perfect the appeal within the allotted time (Pet. App. 5a).

In May 1972, petitioner attempted to file with the Clerk of this Court a paper entitled "Class Action Complaint," seeking nine billion dollars in damages, apparently on the grounds the government had falsely prosecuted him for "stealing his own mail" and had "instrumentally blocked" his appeal.

In June 1972, he submitted to this Court a "Notice of Appeal," referring to the district court criminal docket number but setting forth the same nine billion dollar damage claim contained in his "Class Action Complaint."

The present "petition for writ of certiorari" was filed on August 28, 1972. It does not describe what order of a lower court is sought to be reviewed, but does refer to the dismissal of the appeal from the conviction and to the Clerk's refusal to docket the "Class Action Complaint" in this Court. However, the "questions presented" seem to deal only with allegations that petitioner is entitled to compensatory and punitive damages from the government, the Postal System, and an unnamed state, county, and city.

It is clear that, viewed as a petition for certiorari, the "petition" is untimely and does not conform with the substance of Rule 23(4), since it fails to present "with accuracy, brevity, and clearness whatever is essential to a ready and adequate understanding of the points requiring consideration * * *."[1]

---

[1] Of course, to the extent petitioner seeks to revive an attempt to file an orginal action for damages in this Court, there is no jurisdiction to entertain the action.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

ERWIN N. GRISWOLD,
Solicitor General.

OCTOBER 1972.

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1972 470-493 229